DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 163 SP 035 589

AUTHOR Ham, Maryellen C.; And Others
TITLE Differentiated Teacher Evaluation Equals Enhanced Student Learning.
INSTITUTION Center for Research in Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE), Kalamazoo, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 94
CONTRACT R117Q00047
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the National Evaluation Institute of the Center for Reasearch on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (Gatlinburg, TN, July 10-15, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Demonstration Programs; Educational Improvement; Educational Practices; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Performance Factors; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS Component Theory; *Model Characteristics; *Model Development; Vermont

ABSTRACT

In August of 1991, the Colchester (Vermont) Board of Education and the Colchester Education Association (CEA) jointly initiated a Teacher Evaluation Study Committee. The group assumed responsibility for producing a revised teacher evaluation model which would positively impact the district's teaching and learning process. During school year 1992-1993, 34 teachers and 9 administrators actively participated in a pilot project that employed a differentiated teacher evaluation model. School based meetings were organized to introduce all teachers to the model's five differentiated components: (1) focused assistance: adapting to new contexts; (2) focused assistance: improving current practice; (3) administrator consultation; (4) colleague consultation; and (5) self directed enhancement. The model addresses four major topic areas: classroom teaching, administrative and professional responsibilities, professional development, and goal achievement. Within each of these areas, specific differentiated descriptors define performance standards. Because the implementation of this project remains a "work in progress," no hard data to support its impact is available. Two appendixes provide comprehensive descriptions of the model's differentiated components and detailed charts of performance descriptors for the four major topic areas. (Contains 29 references.) (LL)

ED 376 163

Paper presented at the

CREATE National Evaluation Institute

July 10-15, 1994

Gatlinburg, Tennessee

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHER EVALUATION EQUALS ENHANCED STUDENT LEARNING

Center for Research on Educational Accountability
and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE)

The Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. C. Hamm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Institute was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, (Grant No. R117Q00047). The opinions expressed are those of the authors, and no official support of these positions by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

SP035589

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHER EVALUATION EQUALS ENHANCED STUDENT LEARNING

Dr. Maryellen C. Ham, Associate Superintendent of Schools
Susan Y. Achenbach, School Board Member and Parent
Allegra S. Miller, Elementary Teacher
Bradley N. Blanchette, Secondary Teacher
Martin F. Waldron, School Principal

✧ ✧ ✧

Presentation to National Evaluation Institute
Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation

Park Vista Hotel and Conference Center
Gatlinburg, Tennessee

July 10-15, 1994

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHER EVALUATION EQUALS ENHANCED STUDENT LEARNING

BACKGROUND

In August of 1991, the Colchester, VT Board of Education and the Colchester Education Association (CEA) jointly initiated a Teacher Evaluation Study Committee. This group assumed responsibility for completing the following tasks: 1) reviewing our district's current evaluation process and instruments; 2) assessing the strengths and weaknesses of our present process; 3) surveying employees in order to define their perceptions and needs; 4) studying current research on teacher evaluation in order to integrate theory and practice; and 5) producing a revised teacher evaluation model which will positively impact our district's teaching and learning process. Members of this Study Committee included: four teachers, two principals, one Board member, three community members, and a central office administrator as facilitator.

COMMITTEE PROCESS

The first major task embraced by this Committee included developing a questionnaire designed to involve all staff in assessing our present evaluation process. This questionnaire was subsequently distributed to all district teachers and administrators. A response rate of 68% not only confirmed the importance of this revision process to staff, but also provided committee members with broad based input from both teachers and administrators. In addition to reviewing these survey results, study group participants read and discussed current research in evaluation, and adopted the following district philosophy statement regarding evaluation.

DISTRICT PHILOSOPHY OF STAFF EVALUATION

The Colchester School District believes that each of its employees is capable of continued growth and development. Through its policies and administrative practices, the district is committed to providing appropriate supports and challenges to facilitate such growth. Our evaluation process and forms recognize the differentiated strengths and needs of staff members. Since the ultimate goal of this process is enhanced student learning, Colchester's evaluation system consistently:

- Values people over process or format
- Focuses on student outcomes and school improvement
- Includes personal/professional goals
- Ensures time for communication and consultation
- Provides employees with clearly defined expectations
- Recognizes improved performance
- Specifies areas of need or weakness
- Provides constructive feedback

Teacher evaluation committee members subsequently created two subcommittees in order to consolidate both time and tasks. One subcommittee assumed responsibility for drafting a list of initial evaluation topics with some sample descriptors of teacher behaviors for each topic. The second subcommittee collected data on evaluation systems which matched our goals, and made site visits to discuss with other districts several different evaluation processes/formats. Both subcommittees met in early spring to share their progress, and to recommend next steps in our process. A first step was grounding our proposed model of teacher evaluation in a sound theoretical framework.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Colchester's revised teacher evaluation process is based upon several fundamental beliefs about teaching, learning, and human growth/development. Three key concepts inherent in this belief system are expressed in the following assumptions:

- All human beings are capable of change.
- People continue to grow cognitively throughout life.
- Every human being possesses a vast reservoir of untapped potential.

Throughout the decade of the 1980's, many research studies and staff development efforts focused on the identification of effective schools and on the specific behaviors demonstrated by effective teachers. Several of these studies or programs dissected the teaching act into its component parts. Some also correlated these parts with levels of student achievement. Although helpful in some ways, this approach implies that teaching can be reduced to a collection of scientific or quantifiable elements. Supervisors in schools which implement such programs are trained to objectively observe, record and positively reinforce the teacher's use of defined behaviors. While some teachers both improve and respond favorably to such instructional improvement efforts, several recent research studies cite that many of our most experienced and competent teachers do not benefit from such behavioral training (Blumberg, 1974; Glickman, 1990; Costa, 1991).

While reviewing a variety of research articles on staff supervision, Colchester's Teacher Evaluation Study Committee concurrently surveyed its own staff. Our study revealed that the majority of teachers in Colchester have fifteen plus years of experience and have completed a masters degree and/or a minimum of 30+ credits beyond the BA/BS level. Overall, our district employs mature, experienced staff members who are strongly committed to the concept of continued professional growth and development. What kind of supervision/evaluation process, then, is appropriately motivating, challenging, and capable of enhancing the growth of Colchester's teachers? In attempting to respond to this question, our Study Committee developed an evaluation process and forms based on the following four broad areas of educational research.

TEACHING AS DECISION MAKING

Current research frequently describes the teaching act as a constant stream of decisions, either conscious or unconscious. Teachers make as many as 1,300 decisions according to some estimates. Effective teachers, however, do not mindlessly ask questions or reinforce desired student behaviors. Rather, they select responses from a repertoire of teacher behaviors. These responses are based on information about the learners, an analysis of the teaching task, and an evaluation of the context. Superior teachers also understand how their decisions fit into a broader picture, and they are highly accurate in predicting the impact of their decisions on students' learning. Believing the research on teacher decision making, one of Colchester's goals in revising its evaluation process, was to enhance the number and quality of decisions that teachers both make and assess concerning their own growth and development. Our assumption was that the achievement of this goal will positively influence the decisions teachers then make about appropriate curriculum, instruction, and delivery models for students.

ADULT COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Like children, adults change in predictable ways according to age, individual characteristics, education, and environmental demands. Teachers, therefore, are not all alike in their thinking, motivation, and capacity for change. This key principle and the research base supporting it prompted us to define our revised evaluation process as "differentiated" or responsive to the developmental needs and cognitive stages of all teachers. If our goal is to improve classroom instruction by enabling teachers to become more reflective and flexible, Colchester's supervision practices must mirror a strong commitment to adult developmental theory. Numerous researchers report that teachers and administrators who function at higher stages of adult development demonstrate greater adaptability, tolerance, empathy, and overall effectiveness.

SCHOOL/DISTRICT CLIMATE

Although many factors influence the quality of teacher supervision/evaluation, the norms, culture, and climate of the environment significantly impact teacher behavior. Hidden but powerful cues signal the institutional value system which governs the total organization. Similarly, classroom climate cues signal the implicit curriculum which dictates both teaching and learning outcomes. Unfortunately, many researchers depict schools as "intellectually depressing" places where teachers are often isolated in their own classrooms with little time to collaboratively meet, plan, talk, and/or observe one another. Colchester's revised teacher evaluation process attempts to provide staff with several differentiated options. Our goal is to promote increased collegiality, peer consultation, and self reflection. If successful in achieving this goal, Colchester's school/district climate relative to staff growth and development will be enhanced.

ACTION RESEARCH

Action research in education is study conducted by colleagues within a school or district to enhance the quality of instruction. The value of action research is its focus on the improvement of practice as perceived by the educators involved in the research. Researchers agree that effective supervision/evaluation processes both address and positively impact a school or district's curriculum development, staff development, and organizational development programs. By encouraging teachers to engage in increasingly complex action research projects, Colchester's revised evaluation process will generate both individual and collective opportunities for growth.

SUMMARY

Supervision in successful schools is a developmental function that increases teacher choices, stimulates teacher thinking, and encourages collective action. No scientific algorithm exists for determining a teacher's level of commitment, abstraction, or maturity. Researchers, however, document that these characteristics change over a teacher's career, and that these changes are not always linear. Like all adults, teachers experience regressions, transitions, and recyclings in both their personal and professional lives. Yet, the optimal pattern of teacher career development reveals movement from egocentric to altruistic concerns and from concrete to abstract thinking. Numerous studies of our most successful schools characterize the teachers and administrators in these schools as adults who think in complex and differentiated ways and who view instructional improvement as a systemic effort. A common vision, collective action, challenging ideas, professional conversations, mutual trust, and visible effort are the critical components in highly successful schools. These components, however, are not inherent in schools. In fact, the norms of the work environment in most schools and teachers' established career patterns often work against the development of these components. Through our revised teacher evaluation process, Colchester staff members are not only altering their work environment in ways that stimulate adult growth, but also demonstrating how effective teacher evaluation promotes student learning.

PILOT PROJECT

In May of 1992, the Teacher Evaluation Study Committee voted to implement a pilot project designed to field test our revised evaluation process and forms. Group members agreed to limit this pilot project to approximately forty teachers representing all schools, levels, and several different disciplines. Members also expressed the need to involve all administrators in this pilot project. Throughout the summer of 1992, a subcommittee of Evaluation Study Committee members worked to refine the group's initial product drafts, and to organize an implementation timeline for our pilot project. During school year 1992-1993, thirty-four teachers and nine administrators actively participated in Colchester's pilot project of a differentiated teacher evaluation model. The individual and collective willingness of these staff members to invest time, take some risks, and reflect on current practices enabled Teacher Evaluation Committee members to accomplish their charge. In May 1993, representatives from this committee presented a summary of pilot project results to both the Colchester Education Association (CEA) Executive Board and members of our district School Board. Each of these groups subsequently voted to adopt our proposed differentiated teacher evaluation process for all teachers beginning with the 1993-1994 school year.

IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The major task embraced by committee members and administrators during our implementation process was global staff training on the content, format, and philosophy of our new differentiated teacher evaluation model. School based meetings were organized to introduce all teachers to our model's five differentiated components. A brief introduction to these components follows; more comprehensive descriptions are included in Appendix A.

- **FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: ADAPTING TO NEW CONTEXTS**. When a teacher is new to the district or when s/he has been assigned a new role, the building administrator assumes responsibility for closely supervising this teacher in a focused manner.

- **FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: IMPROVING CURRENT PRACTICE.** Each year building administrators are responsible for identifying any teacher whose performance is defined as marginal or needing improvement. Such teachers will be assigned to this component, and their performance will be closely monitored by a building level administrator.

- **ADMINISTRATOR CONSULTATION.** A teacher may elect to collaborate closely with an administrator in his/her building or in the district. In this component, the teacher and administrator define goals and collaboratively write an action plan for the year.

- **COLLEAGUE CONSULTATION.** Two teachers may choose to share responsibility for achieving self selected, defined goals. Such teachers initially need to engage in a goal setting conference with their building administrator who must support the teachers' collegial evaluation plan.

- **SELF DIRECTED.** Teachers choosing this component desire to enhance their personal and professional development by designing self reflective and highly individualized projects. The self directed component choice must be mutually supported by the teacher and his/her administrator.

Colchester's differentiated teacher evaluation model addresses four major topic areas: Classroom Teaching; Administrative and Professional Responsibilities; Professional Development; and Goal Achievement. Within each of these areas, specific differentiated descriptors define performance standards. The following list outlines these topic areas and performance descriptor titles. A few sample pages of these descriptors are included in Appendix B.

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHER EVALUATION TOPIC AREAS AND PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTORS

CLASSROOM TEACHING
- PLANNING
- INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES
- KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
- LESSON INTRODUCTION, DEVELOPMENT AND SUMMARY
- AFFECTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS
- STUDENT PARTICIPATION/QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES
- ANALYZING AND EVALUATING INSTRUCTION

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
- ROUTINE RESPONSIBILITIES
- PROFESSIONAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES
- MANAGEMENT OF CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT
- DISCIPLINE
- COMMUNICATION

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- COLLEAGUESHIP AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
- INNOVATION

GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
- DISTRICT GOALS AND RELATED INDIVIDUAL GOALS
- SCHOOL GOALS AND RELATED INDIVIDUAL GOALS

Because the implementation of this differentiated teacher evaluation model remains a "work in progress," we do not yet have hard data to support its impact. However, teachers who participated in our pilot project as well as many using the model for the first time this year have shared anecdotal data supporting significant professional growth. Additionally, administrators are continuing to document ways in which increased collegial relationships and more professionally stimulating work environments are promoting enhanced student learning.

SELECTED TEACHER EVALUATION REFERENCES

Barth, R. (1990). Improving Schools From Within. Jossey Bass: NY.

Berliner, D. (1984). "The Half-Full Glass: A Review of Research in Teaching." In Using What We Know About Teaching. Ed. P. Hosford. Alexandria: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Costa, A. (1991). "The School As A Home For The Mind." In A. Costa (Ed.), Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Costa, A., D'Arcangelo, M., Garmston, R. & Zimmerman, D. (1988). Another Set of Eyes: Conferencing Skills. Video tapes and trainer's manual in ASCD's Supervision series. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A. and Garmston, R. (1985). "Supervision For Intelligent Teaching." Educational Leadership, 42(5), 70-80; ASCD.

Costa, A. & Garmston, R. (1986). The Art Of Cognitive Coaching: Supervision For Intelligent Teaching. Sacramento, CA: Institute for Intelligent Behavior.

Fullan, M. (1985). "Change Processes And Strategies At The Local Level." The Elementary School Journal, 85, 391-421.

Garmston, R. (1987). "How Administrators Support Peer Coaching." Educational Leadership, 44(5), 18-26; ASCD.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated Supervision. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.

Glickman, C. (1990). Supervision Of Instruction: A Developmental Approach. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glickman, C. (1993). Renewing America's Schools. Jossey-Bass, Inc.: San Francisco, CA.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A Place Called School: Prospects For The Future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (1992). Understanding Teacher Development. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Jackson, P. (1979). Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Joyce, B. & Showers B. (1988). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longmans.

Levine, S. (1989). Promoting Adult Growth In Schools. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Little, J.W. (1982). "Norms Of Collegiality And Experimentation: Workplace Conditions Of School Success." American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Little and McLaughlin (1993). Teachers' Work. Teachers College Press: NY.

Oja, S.N. (1980). "Adult Development Is Implicit In Staff Development." The Journal of Staff Development, 1(2), 7-56.

Oja, S.N. and Smulyan, L. (1989). Collaborative Action Research. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Schaefer, R. (1967). The School As A Center of Inquiry. Harper Row: NY.

Schon, D. (1990). Educating The Reflective Practitioner. Basic Books: NY.

Shavelson, R. and Borko, H. (1979). "Research On Teacher's Decisions in Planning Instruction." Educational Horizons. 47, 183-189.

Sizer, T. (1989). "Taking School Reform Seriously." Preparing Schools for the 1990's. New York: Metropolitan Company.

Sizer, T. (1985). Horace's Compromise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sprinthall, N. & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). "The Teacher As An Adult Learner: A Cognitive-Developmental View." In Griffin, G. (Ed.), Staff Development, Eighty-Second Yearbook Of The National Society For The Study Of Education, 13-35. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stanley & Popham, Eds. (1988). Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1987). "Experienced Teachers: Agents For Revitalization And Renewal As Mentors And Teacher Educators." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Witherell, C.S. & Erickson, V.L. (1978). "Teacher Education As Adult Development." Theory into Practice, 17 June, 229-238.

DIFFERENTIATED EVALUATION COMPONENTS

- FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: ADAPTING TO NEW CONTEXTS
- FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: IMPROVING CURRENT PRACTICE
- ADMINISTRATOR CONSULTATION
- COLLEAGUE CONSULTATION
- SELF DIRECTED FOCUS

FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: ADAPTING TO NEW CONTEXTS

Overview

The FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: ADAPTING TO NEW CONTEXTS (FA/ANC) component of our differentiated evaluation model is intended to address the needs of two groups of staff members: 1) those new to the Colchester School District; and 2) those engaged in new or significantly different roles/assignments. Participants involved in the FA/ANC component will be formally observed a minimum of four times and will engage in pre and post conferences with his/her administrator on each of these observations. In addition, each of these conferences will reference other classroom visitations and related data collection activities. The initial FA/ANC conference will focus on mutual goal setting and result in the development of a formal action plan for the school year.

Portfolios of all FA/ANC participants must include the following data: 1) Differentiated Evaluation Forms, as appropriate; 2) classroom observation summaries/notes; 3) anecdotal records concerning one or more elements on specific forms and descriptors; 4) copy of teacher's action plan with individual goals; and 5) a summative evaluation report. These portfolios may also include sample lesson plans, student work, and staff development activities. Exit from the FA/ANC evaluation component is dependent on successful completion of action plan goals and demonstrated effectiveness in adapting to new context as defined by the teacher's assigned administrator. The personnel files of teachers in this component will include: 1) an action plan with goals; 2) copies of formal observations; 3) appropriate differentiated evaluation forms; and 4) a summative evaluation report completed by the administrator who has worked with the teacher.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN FA

Administrators:

- Identify those teachers who need to be in FA/ANC.
- Meet with individual FA/ANC teachers to clarify the reasons for their status.
- Mutually develop an action plan and define individual goals with the teachers.
- Discuss performance indicators, criteria, timeline, and data collection.
- Plan formal observations and pre/post conference times.
- Complete/share observation summaries.
- By March 1, discuss with Central Office any teacher whose performance needs significant improvement or is unsatisfactory.
- Recommend placement in one of our Differentiated Model's components for the following year.

Teachers:

- Maintain a supervision/evaluation portfolio.
- Meet with administrator to clarify reasons for FA/ANC status.
- Develop an individual action plan and goals with your administrator.
- Schedule initial conference to define performance criteria and data collection expectations.
- Review differentiated Evaluation Forms; work with administrator to define focus area/descriptors.
- Plan formal pre and post conference times with administrator.
- Discuss summative evaluation report data collected, and status for following year.

FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: IMPROVING CURRENT PRACTICE

Overview

The FOCUSED ASSISTANCE: IMPROVING CURRENT PRACTICE (FA/ICP) component of our differentiated evaluation model is intended to address the needs of experienced staff members with documented instructional deficiencies. Participants involved in the FA/ICP component will be formally observed a minimum of six times and will engage in pre and post conferences with his/her administrator on each of these observations. Administrators will also document multiple classroom visitations and related data collection activities. The initial FA/ICP conference will focus on goal setting and result in the development of a formal improvement plan and timeline for the school year.

Portfolios of all FA/ICP participants must include the following data: 1) an improvement plan with specific goals and activities; 2) classroom observation summaries/notes; 3) anecdotal records and sample student/teacher products; 4) selected differentiated evaluation forms with descriptors defined; and 5) a detailed summative evaluation report including recommendations of administrator. These portfolios may also include sample lesson plans, student work, and staff development activities. Exit from the FA/ICP evaluation component is dependent on the correction of any deficiencies in current practice defined by the teacher's assigned administrator. The personnel files of teachers in this component will include: 1) an improvement plan with specific goals; 2) an interim evaluation report; 3) selected differentiated evaluation forms; 4) a comprehensive summative evaluation; and 5) recommendations regarding the teacher's future employment in the district.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN FA

Administrators:

- Identify those teachers who need to be in FA/ICP.
- Meet with individual FA/ICP teachers to clarify the reasons for their status.
- Develop an action plan and define specific goals for these teachers.
- Discuss performance indicators, criteria, timeline, and data collection.
- Plan formal observations and pre/post conference times.
- Complete/share observation summaries interim and summative evaluation reports.
- By March 1, discuss with Central Office any teacher whose performance is unsatisfactory.
- Recommend non-renewal or placement in one of our Differentiated Model's components for the following year.

Teachers:

- Maintain a supervision/evaluation portfolio.
- Meet with administrator to clarify reasons for FA/ICP status.
- Discuss and improvement action plan components and goals with your administrator.
- Schedule initial conference to define the administrator's criteria for improvement and clarify expectations.
- Differentiated Evaluation Forms; work with administrator to define descriptors and focus areas.
- Schedule formal pre and post conference times with administrator.
- Discuss interim and summative evaluation reports' data collected, and status regarding your improvement of current practice or non-renewal for the following year.

ADMINISTRATOR CONSULTATION

Overview

In the ADMINISTRATOR CONSULTATION: (AC) component of our differentiated evaluation model, a teacher elects to work with an administrator to achieve defined goals. Participants will focus their supervisory interactions on selected topics/descriptors from our Differentiated Model Forms and on specific goals. Goals may be individual, school or discipline related, and/or focused on districtwide initiatives.

Each teacher in the AC component will maintain a portfolio including the following data: 1) an action plan with annual goals stated; 2) selected Differentiated Model forms; 3) administrator observation summaries; 4) pre and post conference notes; and 5) sample student work products, related staff development activities, and/or videotape excerpts. By May 1, the teacher and administrator will engage in a summative conference and write a narrative of this conference. At this time, portfolio contents will be reviewed, and the teacher's participation in one of our model's four components will be collaboratively defined. The personnel files of teachers in this component will include: 1) an action plan with annual goals; 2) selected differentiated evaluation forms; and 3) a summative evaluation summary.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN AC

Administrators:

- Schedule initial goal setting and annual planning conference.
- Discuss Differentiated Model topics and descriptors; identify focus areas.
- Mutually develop a supervisory timeline including observations, conferences, and data collection activities.
- Review teacher's self-evaluation.
- Schedule a summative evaluation conference by May 1 to review/assess portfolio contents.
- Write narrative of summative conference including recommendations for the following year.
- Collaborate with the teacher in defining his/her component participation for the next school year.

Teachers:

- Maintain an individual supervision/evaluation portfolio.
- Participate in annual planning and goal setting conference with administrator.
- Discuss Differentiated Model topics and descriptors; define focus areas.
- Mutually develop a supervisory timeline including observations, conferences, and a variety of data collection activities.
- Complete a self-evaluation.
- Participate in a summative evaluation conference by May 1 to review/assess portfolio contents and annual growth plan, and to discuss self-evaluation.
- Based on discussion of the summative conference summary, define component participation for the following year.

COLLEAGUE CONSULTATION

Overview

In the COLLEAGUE CONSULTATION (CC) component of our differentiated evaluation model, two teachers mutually agree to share responsibility for achieving defined goals. Participants will focus their peer coaching interactions on identified goals as well as selected topics/descriptors from our Differentiated Model forms. Teachers may focus their goals on individual growth, school related issues, and/or districtwide initiatives.

Each teacher engaged in the CC component will maintain a portfolio including the following data: 1) annual action plan including goals and selected Differentiated Model forms; 2) peer observation summaries; 3) pre and post conference notes; 4) staff development activities related to peer coaching and growth plan; and 5) sample student work products, lesson plan outlines, and/or videotape excerpts. By May 1, teachers in the peer consultation component will engage in a summative conference. At this time, portfolio contents will be reviewed. In addition, the peers, in consultation with their administrator, will identify which one of our model's four components is most appropriate for the teacher during the next school year.

As teachers engaged in the colleague consultation component develop their timelines for the year, they are also responsible for sharing the results of both the interim and summative conferences with their administrator(s). Personnel files of teachers engaged in this component will include: 1) annual goals/action plan; 2) selected differentiated evaluation forms; and 3) a collaborative final conference summary.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN CC

Peer Coaches:

- Schedule annual goal setting and planning conference.
- Discuss Differentiated Model topics and descriptors; identify focus areas with peer.
- Mutually develop a timeline which includes pre and post conferences, peer observations, and data collection activities.
- Schedule a summative conference by May 1 to review portfolio contents and to share perceptions regarding your colleague consultation process.
- Collaboratively write conference summary including peer recommendations for next year.
- Schedule an interim and final meeting with the building administrator to share your process and future goals.

Teachers:

- Maintain an individual portfolio.
- Participate in an annual planning and goal setting conference with a colleague.
- Discuss Differentiated Model topics and descriptors; define focus areas.
- Mutually develop a timeline which includes pre and post conferences, peer observations, and data collection activities.
- Participate in a summative conference by May 1 to review portfolio contents and to share perceptions regarding your colleague consultation process.
- Collaboratively write a conference report with your colleague; include directions for continued growth and development.
- Participate in an interim and final meeting with both your peer coach and administrator in order to share your colleague consultation process and data.

Administrators:

- Review and approve annual action plan and goals.
- Participate in interim and final evaluation conferences.
- Mutually define with colleagues the most appropriate component for the teacher to pursue next year.

SELF DIRECTED FOCUS

Overview

The SELF DIRECTED (SD) component of our differentiated evaluation model is intended to address the needs of teachers who wish to enhance their personal and professional development by engaging in several highly reflective individual activities. The decision of a teacher to participate in the self directed component of our model must be mutually supported by his/her administrator. Each initial SD conference will focus on a written action plan proposal submitted by the teacher to his/her principal. Teachers will describe their goals, project activities, rationale, and any required resources. Administrators will clarify the project focus, ask probing questions, and discuss ways to assess results.

Sample activities which may be pursued by teachers engaged in the SD component include:

- Researching and sharing new teaching strategies on a specific topic.
- Organizing and implementing workshops related to a school or district goal.
- Developing pre and post testing programs to evaluate student learning.
- Conducting a curriculum audit in one subject area.
- Facilitating the implementation of an action research proposal.
- Writing a handbook for students, parents, and/or other staff on a particular topic.
- Initiating and facilitating a study team on alternative assessment strategies in your school.

Each teacher in the SD component will maintain a portfolio including the following data: 1) annual goals; 2) copy of the teacher's individual action plan and accompanying timeline; 3) a reflective journal; 4) staff development activities related to the action plan; and 5) samples of student and/or teacher work products and assessment data. During the year, the teacher and his/her administrator will participate in an interim and a summative conference. These conferences will enable both staff members to review portfolio contents, assess results, and define project impact. By May 1, the teacher and administrator will mutually determine which of our four evaluation components the teacher will pursue the following year.

The personnel files of teachers in the self directed component will include: 1) a detailed action plan proposal; 2) a comprehensive self assessment; and 3) a summary of the May conference held with the collaborating administrator.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN SD

Teachers:

- Develop an action plan proposal with a self directed focus; submit to your principal.
- Maintain an individual portfolio as described in overview above.
- Schedule a meeting with your administrator to discuss action plan and proposed timeline.
- Refine, expand, and/or limit your action plan based on reflection and/or feedback received.
- Develop specific strategies to collect data on your project, analyze collated data, synthesize results, and assess impact.
- Meet with your principal to discuss action plan progress, and by May 1, to review portfolio contents.
- Write a self assessment summary describing your action plan's content, process, and results; include comments regarding your participation in this self directed evaluation component.
- Discuss with your administrator the feasibility of sharing your self directed activities with other staff members and/or audiences.

Administrators:

- Meet with teacher in SD component to review and discuss action plan proposal.
- Collaborate with the teacher to refine, expand, and/or limit action plan, timeline, and data collection activities.
- Facilitate the teacher's implementation of his/her action plan by providing available resources.
- Meet with the teacher at mid year to review progress and by May 1 to review portfolio contents as well as teacher's self assessment.
- Collaborate with the teacher to extend his/her research project and to share results with other audiences.
- Mutually define the most appropriate component for the teacher to pursue next year.

APPENDIX B

TOPIC AREAS AND PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTORS

PART I: CLASSROOM TEACHING

I-A. PLANNING

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• States relationship between this lesson and long range goals. • Predicts student learning resulting from this instruction. • Envisions, describes, and sequences instructional strategies. • Addresses content, time sequences, grouping structure, and learning activities. • Demonstrates broad repertoire of teacher behaviors and instructional materials. • Attends and contributes to team meetings related to student support (i.e. BST, IEP, CST, SST). • Promotes collaboration, trust, and sharing of expertise through appropriate planning.	• Develops short and long range plans. • Predicts some learnings that will result from this instruction. • Demonstrates understanding of lesson sequence and grouping structures. • Uses more than one material to teach a lesson. • Regularly attends and contributes to team meetings.	• Only follows "canned" lessons from a textbook or other prepared written materials. • Plans "day to day." • Varies class format very little. • Uses limited materials and resources when planning. • Attends few team meetings; demonstrates limited follow through.	• Lacks evidence of overall sequence in lesson plans. • Unclear about what student learnings may result. • Does not vary class format. • Is frequently unprepared for lessons. • Does not participate in team meetings.

I-B. INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Understands and fosters individual differences; consistently designs instruction and expectations according to student needs. • Develops successful experiences for all students on a daily basis. • Demonstrates sound instructional practices based on learning theory and current research. • Groups students and activities to accommodate learning styles, interests, skill needs, etc. • Is aware of and utilizes Instructional Support Services personnel to their full potential. • Identifies and shares students' strengths and weaknesses; works effectively with other staff members. • Provides appropriate class accommodations for all students. • Participates in planning, development and implementation of IEP's.	• Aware of individual differences among students. • Designs most lessons to accommodate individual differences. (i.e. Chapter I, Special Ed. ESL, and Section 504 students.) • Provides some options for students to learn in a variety of ways. • Occasionally seeks help from others to meet student needs. • Is aware of and utilizes Instructional Support Services, but not as an integral part of daily programming. • Identifies and shares students' needs; generally works effectively with other staff to meet individual differences. • Provides appropriate accommodations for students.	• Aware of extreme and obvious differences among students. • Demonstrates little variation in student expectations and grouping practices. • Designs and implements few accommodations or options for learning. • Uses other resource personnel to assist in meeting student needs only when problems occur.	• Consistently teaches to "whole class" or group. • Provides few, if any, alternatives for students. • Demonstrates no interest in seeking or using other resources to assist in meeting student needs. • Does not include Instructional Support Services in classroom planning, management and delivery of instruction. • Does not follow goals, objectives and accommodations of students' IEP's.

I-C. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Demonstrates a thorough understanding of current content/subject matter. • Evidences genuine scholarship through continuous professional development. • Demonstrates inter-relationships among content areas. • Illustrates subject matter knowledge by using a variety of different materials and citing a range of pertinent anecdotes.	• Demonstrates competent knowledge of subject matter(s) required for present position. • Uses appropriate materials and personal anecdotes in teaching content knowledge. • Updates knowledge base by periodically taking courses and attending workshops.	• Demonstrates superficial understanding of content or subject matter. • Keeps "one page/ chapter ahead of students" or "wings it" routinely. • Uses few related resource materials beyond the textbook. • Rarely attends workshops or takes courses to update knowledge base.	• Demonstrates inadequate knowledge base for current teaching assignment. • Avoids or incompletely answers student questions on content presented. • Does not use related resources to extend teaching or enhance student learning. • Documents few, if any, professional development experiences in content knowledge.

I-D. LESSON INTRODUCTION, DEVELOPMENT AND SUMMARY

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Demonstrates creativity in motivating students to attend to daily lessons. • Reviews prior learning while defining purposes and objectives of new lesson. • Relates new learning to past and future lessons. • Demonstrates a variety of teaching techniques and materials. • Makes smooth, logical transitions and deals effectively with unanticipated situations. • Summarizes the lesson for all learners. • Reviews assignments, responds effectively to students' questions, and suggests optional resources.	• Achieves attention of students. • Reviews previous lessons taught. • Defines new lesson objectives and varies activities. • Generally makes smooth transitions and handles most unexpected situations. • Recaps main points of the lesson and clarifies most difficult parts. • Explains assignments and responds to students' questions.	• Spends time and effort ineffectively to gain students' attention and task motivation. • Defines lesson objectives superficially; purpose vague. • Fails to connect current learning to past and future lessons. • Inflexibile in responding to unexpected questions or situations. • Shares inappropriate and/or unrelated illustrations or examples. • Recaps lesson parts in a hurried fashion. • Lacks clarity about student assignments.	• Unable to gain students' attention and motivation. • Organizes lessons and materials poorly. • Lacks clarity in stating lesson's purpose and objectives. • Fails to connect learning activities, and to deal with students' inattention. • Handles unexpected situations poorly; transitions appear unplanned. • Provides no lesson summary. • Creates confusion by quickly stating homework assignments at the last minute.

I-E. AFFECTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Demonstrates respect and fairness toward all students. • Models enthusiasm for learning and possesses a genuine sense of humor. • Uses voice/gestures appropriately to emphasize learning. • Speaks clearly and articulately while demonstrating an excellent use of the English language. • Conveys to each student a sense of personal identity and "individual caring". • Handles unexpected situations with confidence. • Demonstrates support when students seek alternative resources (SPED, Chapter I, Computer, Guidance, Library, etc).	• Demonstrates courtesy, cheerfulness, and tact in dealing with students. • Models a conscientious attitude toward learning. • Generally uses voice and gestures effectively. • Speaks easily, free from distractions, and demonstrates good use of the English language. • Conveys sense of fairness to students. • Is usually supportive of students' needs; often supports students seeking alternative resources.	• Demonstrates courtesy, but sometimes conveys a lack of respect for students. • Appears aloof at times, and occasionally uses sarcasm. • Allows emotions to affect patience and decision making. • Lacks consistent pattern of enthusiasm for learning and teaching. • Uses voice and gestures ineffectively, and is careless with the English language. • Shows limited support for students seeking alternative resources.	• Allows lack of respect and courtesy to permeate classroom relationships. • Demonstrates lack of enthusiasm regarding new learning and shows little, if any humor. • Uses sarcasm and threats to achieve compliance. • Distracts students from learning by using a monotonous voice, infrequent eye contact, ineffective speech, mannerisms or gestures, and shows disregard for the English language. • Does not attend to the needs of students.

I-F. STUDENT PARTICIPATION/QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Elicits active participation by all students. • Balances participation: teacher/student; and student/student. • Encourages independent thinking and learning. • Nurtures classroom climate of trust and mutual respect. • Teaches and models excellent study skills (i.e. discussion, debate, roles in group processes). • Addresses questions of varying levels; encourages students to generate their own questions. • Demonstrates knowledge of students' cognitive development and consciously stimulates higher level thinking skills. • Instills the desire in students to learn beyond the classroom setting.	• Engages most students in daily learning activities. • Generally balances student/teacher participation in learning. • Ensures that students practice study skills appropriate to the tasks. • Handles the mechanics of questioning techniques with competence (i.e. wait time, checking for understanding, inclusion of all students, etc.). • Plans a variety of different kinds and levels of questions for each lesson. • Elicits questions from students.	• Relies on some student participation routinely; forces participation of others. • Favors "teacher talk" over students' activities. • Deals ineffectively with student distraction and "time off task." • Asks questions which generally require recall of facts or simple responses. • Seldom asks students to generate questions. • Allows frequent interruptions during discussions.	• Demonstrates difficulty engaging students in class activities. • Allows students to "tune out", engage in social activities, and/or appear bored and restless. • Reveals little evidence of planned questions related to the lesson. • Asks some questions which are irrelevant or vague. • Discourages student generated questions which could lead to productive discussions. • Misunderstands and/or misrepresents reasons for poor student participation.

I-G. ANALYZING AND EVALUATION INSTRUCTION

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Collects data (formal checklist, informal notes, student artifacts, etc.) concerning instruction; recalls details. • Analyzes and synthesizes data in order to impact future teaching and learning. • Compares intended and actual outcomes. • Hypothesizes causal relationships regarding the achievement (or not) of objectives. • Evaluates self as planner, instructor, decision maker, facilitator, and assessor. • Reflects on current practices as a means to enhance student outcomes. • Uses a variety of human and material resources to refine the assessment of instruction.	• Recalls some detailed data concerning instruction. • Defines reasons why some objectives were not achieved. • Frequently evaluates self-performance as teacher. • Summarizes why lesson went well or did not go well. • Uses evaluation data when planning future lessons.	• Recalls some data concerning instruction. • Lacks clarity about why some objectives were not achieved. • Seldom evaluates self-performance as a teacher. • Seldom alters teaching strategies based on an assessment of student learning.	• Recalls little data about details concerning instruction. • Lacks understanding of the relationship between teacher actions and student learning. • Does not engage in self reflection as a means to learning or enhancing instruction. • Does not alter teaching strategies based on an assessment of student learning.

PART II: ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

II-A. ROUTINE RESPONSIBILITIES

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Submits all needed paperwork (i.e. grades, parent reports, surveys, progress reports, etc) thoroughly, accurately, and on time. • Supervises students with respect across school settings to provide for a safe, disciplined and drug-free environment. • Communicates and models professional behavior while interacting with students and staff. • Uses duty assignments to relate to students outside the classroom role.	• Meets deadlines for completing required administrative tasks. • Recognizes clerical and duty tasks as part of job. • Accepts need to supervise and enforces rules. • Is punctual and active during duty assignments.	• Completes most tasks on time; some inaccuracies noted. • Recognizes that some clerical and duty tasks are important. • Enforces rules selectively and sporadically. • Arrives late for some supervisory duties; is inattentive to student needs.	• Usually turns in tasks late; often incomplete. • Views supervisory tasks as "add on," not part of job responsibilities. • Rarely considers correcting/supervising students not assigned to him/her. • Usually arrives late for supervisory duties. • Completes personal tasks during duty time on routine basis. • Unaware of students' behavior; makes few attempts to enforce rules.

II-B. PROFESSIONAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Knowledgeable about laws affecting education (e.g. PL 94-142; [IDEA] Act 230; Title IX; Section 504; etc.). • Participates in shaping school and district procedures and policies. • Models professional behavior in responding to both the letter and spirit of laws and regulations. • Exceeds performance expectations outlined in Teacher Handbook, CLSB Plan, job description, and curriculum guides. • Understands, articulates, and implements the school's and district's philosophy or mission statements to colleagues, parents, and others. • Knows students' needs and works cooperatively with all staff in developing and implementing a variety of appropriate instructional accommodations. • Participates in planning, developing and implementating IEP's. • Is knowledgeable and implements laws regarding discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or demonstrated ability.	• Knowledgeable about most laws affecting students and staff. • Meets and follows most laws/policies. • Aware of school/district philosophy or mission statements and other policies or procedures. • Cooperates with all staff in meeting the needs of identified high risk students. • Meets performance expectations defined in his/her position description. • Is knowledgeable and implements laws regarding discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or demonstrated ability.	• Aware of some federal and state laws affecting students/staff. • Follows laws and school/district policies as deemed appropriate. • Rarely refers to the school's or district's philosophy or mission statements or other documents. • Needs reminders regarding his/her responsibilities to special needs students. • Aware, but does not always meet the performance expectations defined in his/her position description. • Is knowledgeable and implements laws regarding discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or demonstrated ability.	• Unaware of most federal and state laws affecting education. • Needs reminders that such laws exist. • Is not aware of school's or district's philosophy or mission statements or other documents. • Fails to accommodate students with identified special needs. • Openly complains about and does not meet professional expectations or responsibilities. • Does not follow goals, objectives and accommodations of students' IEP's. • Does not have a good understanding of laws regarding discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or demonstrated ability.

II-C. MANAGEMENT OF CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Manages all routines and utilizes instructional materials efficiently and effectively. • Ensures that interruptions/ distractions to instructional time are minimal or non-existent. • Enriches room environment to promote learning (displays student work, classroom decorations, room arrangement, etc.) • Ensures that all students know and meet classroom expectations. • Creates a safe and trusting environment.	• Manages most routines efficiently. • Prepares instructional materials before class. • Arranges room to accommodate instruction. • Permits some interruptions to instructional time on routine basis. • Demonstrates some imagination in classroom decorations. • Explains classroom rules; most students cooperate.	• Manages routines inconsistently. • Loses instructional time because of poor organization of materials. • Allows frequent interruptions/ distractions during instructional time. • Demonstrates little imagination in classroom decorations. • Rarely changes room arrangements. • Seldom reinforces classroom rules positively.	• Manages routines poorly and inefficiently. • Loses significant instructional time on a regular basis because of poor organization/ planning. • Confuses students with unclear directions and procedures. • Permits interruptions routinely; creates many interruptions/ distractions. • Displays little, if any, student work; classroom decor is bland, uninteresting, and rarely changes. • Classroom rules and expectations are unclear and selectively enforced.

II-D. **DISCIPLINE**

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Ensures order through mutual trust and respect. • Models self discipline and mutual respect. • Implements school and district policies and practices. • Embraces concepts which emphasize respect, fairness, and self-control. • Facilitates and rewards self-motivation. • Learns and shares knowledge of different philosophical approaches to discipline (i.e. Reality Therapy, Assertive Discipline, Discipline with Dignity, etc). • Confronts, thoughtfully questions, and supports others regarding their behavior.	• Achieves order by teaching and following through with rules and expectations. • Models self discipline and fairness. • Adheres to school/district policies and practices. • Follows through with appropriate consequences for inappropriate behavior. • Engages appropriate school and family members in the discipline process. • Shares successful strategies and practices with colleagues. • Generally confronts others regarding their behavior.	• Knows but does not always implement school/district policies and practices. • Relies on personality to maintain order and control. • Recognizes discipline problems, but deals ineffectively with most. • Uses threats often; sometimes uses sarcasm and ridicule. • Lacks follow through and appropriate consequences. • Seldom confronts others regarding their behavior.	• Disregards school/district policies and procedures. • Unaware and/or unresponsive to most discipline problems in classroom. • Permits disorder and disrespect. • Blames parents, administrators, other students/staff for lack of order in school. • Does not confront others regarding their behavior.

II-E. COMMUNICATION

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Effectively articulates school and classroom goals to parents and students. • Engages in ongoing dialogue with students, parents, and other staff regarding educational activities and school rules. • Initiates a variety of different ways to clearly and supportively communicate student progress or needs. • Celebrates successes. • Regularly invites parents, community members, business representatives, and other staff to participate in classroom activities.	• Communicates goals to parents and students. • Informs parents and students about classroom expectations and school rules. • Shares student progress with parents and students through written notes, narratives, and conferences. • Develops effective ways to share individual work and classroom activities with parents and other staff.	• Communicates minimally with parents and students. • Completes quarterly report cards and schedules parent conferences on designated district days. • Sends notes and information to parents regarding field trips and/or class activities requiring permission or cost. • Rarely involves parents or community members in classroom activities.	• Writes inconclusive and general report card narratives. • Does not invite parents or others to visit or volunteer in classroom. • Participates only in required communication regarding educational activities and student progress.

PART III: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

III-A. COLLEAGUESHIP AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Engages in a variety of formal and informal professional activities, and maintains a professional portfolio. • Reads and shares journals, books and professional publications on a routine basis. • Shares knowledge, expertise, experience, and enthusiasm with colleagues. • Initiates and implements activities designed to promote professional growth. • Promotes education as a valued lifelong endeavor. • Builds professional relationships as a supportive team member. • Works with others to evaluate, create, and implement new educational opportunities. • Challenges and encourages colleagues in ways that promote colleagueship, professional growth and professional behavior.	• Takes courses and attends workshops or conferences, and maintains a professional portfolio. • Reads journals and professional publications related to current assignment. • Discusses educational issues or practices with other staff. • Maintains professional relationships with staff. • Willing to implement new educational opportunities. • Generally challenges and encourages colleagues in ways that promote colleagueship, professional growth and professional behavior.	• Meets local standards board requirements for professional development. • Rarely reads journals or professional publications. • States relicensing or salary schedule movement as the only motivation for taking part in professional growth activities. • Minimally maintains a professional portfolio. • Is selective in maintaining professional relationships with staff. • Willing to implement new educational opportunities when directed to do so. • Does not confront or challenge unprofessional behavior of colleagues. • Rarely challenges and encourages colleagues in ways that promote colleagueship, professional growth and professional behavior.	• Little evidence or interest in professional growth. • Does not read professional publications. • Does not maintain professional portfolio. • Professional/collegial relationships are not maintained. • Resists new ideas and approaches. • Unaware and/or unconcerned about the professional growth and behavior of other colleagues.

III-B. INNOVATION

★ DESCRIPTORS	■ DESCRIPTORS	▲ DESCRIPTORS	● DESCRIPTORS
• Develops creative lessons; engages learners in a variety of interdisciplinary activities. • Encourages and models risk taking. • Shares new ideas while seeking/incorporating the ideas of others. • Capitalizes on limitations/constraints as opportunities for "invention." • Challenges self, students, and others to discover new methods and practices. • Demonstrates commitment and imagination in the use of instructional devices, including technology. • Nurtures student/staff/parent participation in the development of a variety of enrichment activities. • Values the study of the future and its implications for the development of relevant programs and courses.	• Seeks new ideas and incorporates these in planning/teaching. • Attends educational activities which stimulate creative thinking. • Discusses imaginative practices with other staff members. • Adapts and demonstrates new ways to use instructional devices and technology. • Encourages students to be creative and innovative.	• Teaches with little creativity or imagination. • Takes few, if any, risks in trying new ideas. • Demonstrates routines versus innovations. • Integrates technology on a limited basis.	• Unaware of need to develop creative strategies. • Demonstrates a limited commitment to the use of innovative learning activities. • Relies only on textbooks and prepared materials to teach. • Feels uncomfortable or unprepared to use or teach with available technology.